

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional claim fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims is not more than three, and the total number of claims is not more than originally filed. A Petition for an extension of time is enclosed.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Specification

Applicant has amended the Abstract to reach the suggested 50 words.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicant has amended Claims 13 and 16 for clarity, and has amended Claim 31 into independent form.

Drawings

Applicant has enclosed a copy of FIGS. 1 and 2 for the Examiner's convenience. This sheet of FIGS. 1 and 2 was downloaded from the electronic file wrapper for this Patent Application on the USPTO website, and is thus already of record (See also this Patent Application's publication).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Applicant believes the above Amendment overcomes the rejection of Claims 13 and 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-28, 31-36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adorno, U.S. Patent 5,802,828, is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's claimed invention is a fishing line with a core made of at least one multifilament yarn of a synthetic organic fiber material, and a casing made of small film strips of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) which are firmly wound on the core in a S-direction and Z-direction, or vice versa.

The Office Action states the Adorno Patent teaches PTFE tapes wound about a core. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The PTFE tapes of the Adorno Patent

are not wound on the core as in Applicant's claimed invention. The Adorno Patent's aramide core is "between the said yarns 1" (Col. 3, lines 37-38; Fig. 2) and more particularly "laminated between two single PTFE yarns 1" (Col. 4, line 12; Fig. 3). The Adorno Patent specifically teaches applying PTFE tapes in a linear manner (Figs. 2 and 3) and does not teach or provide any suggestion for wound PTFE tapes, as in Applicant's claimed invention.

It would not have been obvious to alter the teachings of the Adorno Patent with PTFE tapes wound on the core. The Adorno Patent specifically teaches the linearly applied tapes for forming the desired packing yarn for sealing pump or rotating valve shafts (which is not a fishing line). The Office Action claims alternating wraps with multiple tapes was well known, yet the Adorno Patent makes no indication that such wrapping is a suitable substitute. The Adorno Patent specifically teaches the linear lamination process for protecting and covering the core filament. The Office Action does not state why the alleged wrapping would be better protection than the complete and smooth linear lamination covering of the Adorno Patent.

The yarn of the Adorno Patent is not suitable for a fishing line. According to the Adorno Patent, the composite yarns are braided to form a packing of a plurality of yarns, each consisting of an aramide core and a PTFE sheath. There is no disclosure of a fishing line, and aramide cores are not generally suitable for

fishng lines under normal circumstances. Fishing lines are typically knotted to a hook, and such knotting causes heavy deflection of the core. An aramide fiber will break upon such heavy deflection. Further, the smooth sheath of the Adorno Patent will promote loosening of a fishing knot. Thus there are several reasons the yarn of the Adorno Patent would not be suitable for a fishing line.

Applicant respectfully asserts the claimed invention is not obvious for at least the reasons stated above. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-38 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-11, 13, 32-37, 39, and 50 of copending Serial No. 10/918,334. As this is a provisional double patenting rejection, this Patent Application can be allowed to proceed to issuance. If the Examiner determines that both Patent Applications are in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss whether the rejection is maintained in view of the otherwise allowable claims.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 11, 19, 29-30, and 37 have not been rejected over any prior art reference and are thus understood to contain allowable subject matter. However, Applicant believes broader aspects of the invention are allowable for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Applicant intends to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicant has not addressed or resolved in this response, the undersigned attorney again requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicant sincerely believes that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully requests early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Reg. No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road, Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169
(847) 490-1400 FAX (847) 490-1403